



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CL
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/779,421	02/13/2004	Robert H. Wollenberg	T-6320 (538-66)	9070

7590 09/22/2006

Michael E. Carmen, Esq.
M. CARMEN & ASSOCIATES, PLLC
Suite 400
170 Old Country Road
Mineola, NY 11501

EXAMINER

TRAN, MY CHAU T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1639

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/779,421

Applicant(s)

WOLLENBERG, ROBERT H.

Examiner

MY-CHAU T. TRAN

Art Unit

1639

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 February 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-21, drawn to a high throughput method for screening lubricating oil composition, classified in class 435, subclass DIG 14.
 - II. Claims 22-32, drawn to a system, classified in class 436, subclass 43.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Claims 33-34 link(s) inventions of Group I and Group II. The restriction requirement between the linked inventions is **subject to** the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), claims 33-34. Upon the indication of allowability of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions **shall** be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be rejoined and fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104 **Claims that require all the limitations of an allowable linking claim** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

Applicant(s) are advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, the allowable linking claim, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the

Art Unit: 1639

provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 443 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

3. Inventions of Group I and Group II are related as process and apparatus for its practice.

The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)).

In this case the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process, e.g. the method for screening a collection of chemically diverse materials for desirable performance characteristics and properties such as strength, tack, adhesiveness.

4. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and/or divergent subject matter. The different methods would require completely different searches in both the patent and non-patent databases, and there is no expectation that the searches would be coextensive. Therefore, this does create an undue search burden, and restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. This application contains claims directed to patentably distinct species of the claimed invention for Groups I-II. Election is required as follows.

6. If applicant elects the invention of Group I, applicant is required to elect from the following patentably distinct species. Claim 1 is generic.

Subgroup 1: Species of a lubricating oil composition library (e.g., see claims 1, 33, and 34)

Applicant is required to elect, for search purposes, a *single specific* lubricating oil composition library. The election should result in a *particularly defined* core structure that is shared by all the library members. In defining this core structure, all variable groups should be defined (i.e. all atoms and bonds shown) as much as possible.

Subgroup 2: Species of an elastomer (e.g., see claims 4 and 5)

Applicant is required to elect, for search purposes, a *single specific* elastomer.

The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting materials from which they are made. Moreover, the above species can be separately classified. Consequently, the species have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter. Therefore, this does create an undue search burden, and election for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species of the above species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

7. If applicant elects the invention of Group II, applicant is required to elect from the following patentably distinct species. Claim 22 is generic.

Subgroup 1: Species of a lubricating oil composition library (e.g., see claims 22, 33, and 34)

Art Unit: 1639

Applicant is required to elect, for search purposes, a *single specific* lubricating oil composition library. The election should result in a *particularly defined* core structure that is shared by all the library members. In defining this core structure, all variable groups should be defined (i.e. all atoms and bonds shown) as much as possible.

Subgroup 2: Species of an elastomer (e.g., see claim 22)

Applicant is required to elect, for search purposes, a *single specific* elastomer.

The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting materials from which they are made. Moreover, the above species can be separately classified. Consequently, the species have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter. Therefore, this does create an undue search burden, and election for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species of the above species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

8. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species of the above species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Art Unit: 1639

9. Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement **must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added.** An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered **nonresponsive** unless accompanied by an election.

10. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, **applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.** MPEP § 809.02(a).

11. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention. Because the above restriction/election requirement is complex, a telephone call to applicants to request an oral election was not made. See MPEP § 812.01.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In

Art Unit: 1639

either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to My-Chau T. Tran whose telephone number is 571-272-0810. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday: 8:00-2:30; Tuesday-Thursday: 7:30-5:00; Friday: 8:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Paras, Jr., can be reached on 571-272-4517. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

My-Chau T. Tran
Patent Examiner
September 16, 2006

